



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,765	11/19/2001	Manfred Bartz	CYPR-CD01194M	2082

7590 04/17/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,765

Applicant(s)

BARTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 01/09/2006 to the original application filed 11/19/2001.
2. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 31-34 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

4. Claims 1, 4-11, 14-21, and 24-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Sorge et al.** (U.S. 6,613,098, issued 06/1999).

As to claim 1:

Art Unit: 2176

Sorge teaches a method for facilitating the display of information (*e.g., presented in HTML*) of a document (*e.g., the workbook*) [see col.15, lines 45-60], the method comprising:

- (i) scanning (*e.g., looks at the data for any document-level properties relating to the entire workbook or individual worksheets*) said document (*e.g., the workbook*) for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location (*e.g., sheets001.html, sheet002.html, or chart001.html indicating locations of sheets1, sheet2 or chart1 within the workbook*) within said document [see the workbook discussion, beginning at col.15, line 45]; and
- (ii) in response to said scanning, automatically rendering (*e.g., loading*) graphic elements (*e.g., chart1*) for each corresponding indicator, wherein a graphic element is rendered with a descriptive label according to information within said indicator [see the navigation controls discussion, beginning at col.16, line 13]; and
- (iii) jumping to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to a graphic element selected by a user and displaying information of said predetermined location (*e.g., clicking on a link loads the selected worksheet into the worksheet frame*) [see the accessing workbook discussion, beginning at col.16, line 13].

As to claim 4:

Sorge teaches the document is an HTML document (*e.g., HTML document; col.3, lines 32-52 & fig.2*).

As to claim 5:

Sorge teaches the indicators are embedded HTML anchors (*e.g., links; col.16, lines 13-15*).

As to claim 6:

Sorge teaches the document is an XML document (*e.g., XML; fig.2*).

As to claims 7-8:

Sorge teaches the document is selected from a catalog of documents (*col.1, lines 16-22*).

As to claim 9:

Sorge teaches the graphic elements are rendered adjacent to the document (*col.7, lines 51-65 & col.16, lines 34-46*).

As to claim 10:

Sorge teaches a user interacting with a scroll bar for scrolling through the document activates a graphic element upon passing a corresponding indicator of the graphic element, such that a current location on the document is rendered (*col.16, lines 13-33*).

As to claim 11:

It is directed to a computer system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, Sorge teaches a bus (*e.g., a system bus 123; col. 18, line 44 and fig.4*); a display device (*e.g., display device 147; col.19, line 22 and fig.4*); a memory (*e.g., ROM; col.18, lines 49-50 and fig.4*); and a processor (*e.g., processing unit 121 and fig.4*).

As to claims 14-20:

They include the same limitations as in claims 4-10 respectively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 21:

It is directed to a computer-usable medium for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claims 24-30:

They include the same limitations as in claims 4-10 respectively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 2-3, 12-13, and 22-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sorge et al.** in view of **Ackerman et al.** (U.S. 6,384,947, filed 03/1999).

As to claims 2, 12, and 22:

- a. Sorge does not explicitly teach “*the document is for use in programming a programmable microcontroller comprising programmable digital and programmable analog elements.*”
- b. Ackerman teaches the document is for use in programming a programmable microcontroller comprising programmable digital and programmable analog elements (*col.4, lines 33-48*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Ackerman in the system of Sorge because it would have performed many different functions on the digital inputs and with software using mathematical equations, versus attempting to use analog circuit components to accomplish the same type of function in an analog system.

As to claims 3, 13, and 23:

- a. Anderson does not explicitly teach “*the document is a datasheet providing technical details of a corresponding user module, wherein a user module is a pre-configured circuit design for implementation on a microcontroller.*”
- b. Ackerman teaches the document is a datasheet providing technical details of a corresponding user module, wherein a user module is a pre-configured circuit design for implementation on a microcontroller (*table 2, col.8*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Ackerman in the system of Sorge because it would have performed many different functions on the digital inputs

and with software using mathematical equations versus attempting to use analog circuit components to accomplish the same type of function in an analog system.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 01/09/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. Applicant argues that *Sorge does not teach a method for facilitating the display of information of a document including "scanning the document for indicators, where the indicators are indicating a predetermined location with the document"* [Remarks, page 5, 1st paragraph].

In response, *Sorge* teaches facilitating the display of information (*e.g., presented in HTML*) of a document including scanning (*e.g., looks at the data for any document-level properties relating to the entire workbook or individual worksheets*) the document (*e.g., the workbook*) for indicators, where the indicators are indicating a predetermined location (*e.g., sheets001.html, sheet002.html, or chart001.html indicating locations of sheets1, sheet2 or chart1 within the workbook*) with the document [see the workbook discussion, beginning at col.15, line 45].

- b. Applicant argues that *Sorge does not teach the worksheets include any type of indicators for indicating predetermined locations within the worksheets themselves* [Remarks, page 5].

In response, *Sorge teaches worksheets include any type of indicators for indicating predetermined locations within the worksheets themselves (e.g., sheets001.html, sheet002.html, or chart001.html indicating locations of sheet1, sheet2 or chart1 within the workbook) [see the workbook discussion, beginning at col.15, line 45].*

- c. Applicant argues that *Sorge does not teach jumping within individual worksheets* [Remarks, page 5].

In response, *Sorge's teaching "clicking on a link loads the selected worksheet into the worksheet frame"(col.16, lines13-33) reads-on the claimed "jumping within individual worksheets" (e.g., when sheet1 is presenting, a click on sheet3 will load sheet3 into the worksheet frame – a jump from sheet1 to sheet3).*

- d. Applicant argues that *Ackerman alone or in combination with Sorge, does not teach "scanning said document for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within said document" and "jumping to a*

predetermined location within said document corresponding to the graphic element selected by a user” as claimed [Remarks, page 7].

In response, Sorge is used to teach the claimed “*scanning said document for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within said document*” and “*jumping to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to the graphic element selected by a user*”, not

Ackerman.

- e. Applicant argues that Ackerman does not teach “*scanning said document for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within said document*” and “*jumping to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to the graphic element selected by a user*” [Remarks, page 8].

In response, the Examiner agrees. Ackerman is not used to teach “*scanning said document for indicators, wherein said indicators are for indicating a predetermined location within said document*” and “*jumping to a predetermined location within said document corresponding to the graphic element selected by a user*”. In fact, Sorge alone meets the limitations as claimed.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Anderson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,282,551 Issued: Aug. 28, 2001
- Bartz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,701,508 Issued: Mar. 2, 2004
- Bartz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,715,132 Issued: Mar. 30, 2004
- Ferlitsch et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0091739 A1 Pub. Date: Jul. 11, 2002
- "PSoC Designer: Integrated Development Environment, Getting Started 25-Minute Tutorial, Version 1.0," Cypress Microsystems, Inc., CMS10006A, July 3, 2001, pp. 1-25.
- "PSoC Technology Completely Changes 8-Bit MCU System Design!," Cypress Microsystems, Inc., February. 19, 2001, pp. 1-21.

Contact information

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2176

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
4/3/2006